

## REMARKS

Independent claims 1, 8, 22 and 23 have been amended to more particularly specify what is meant by the term “representation” which respect to “using a condensed abstract representation of a search term density distribution.” Support for these amendments can be found in the specification on page 16, lines 1-18. Newly added claims 24 – 26 have language similar to that in amended claim 1.

It is believed that these amendments should overcome the rejections. Applicants note that in its decision of June 30, 2010 (“Decision”), the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences affirmed the rejection of the claims only by attaching a very broad interpretation to the term “representation”

With respect to claim 1, the Decision states on pages 4 - 5:

“Appellants contend that “[a]s taught in the specification on page 16, lines 1-18 markers represent the frequency with which search terms occur in the portion of the document represented by that marker, using relative darkness, color, and patterns for example to represent different densities...Applicant is trying to limit search term density to mean density represented by relative darkness, color and patters; however none of these limitations are present in the claims.” (*emphasis added*, see Decision at 4-5)

“We give the claims their broadest reasonable interpretation...Moreover, we will not read limitations from the Specification into the claims....Claim 1 does not place any

limitations on what “density” means, includes, or represents, other than that the “condensed abstract representation” is of “a search term density distribution...We therefore interpret “density” as meaning a condition of being dense...”reading on generation of any summary view using representation of search terms of various densities, i.e., conditions being dense.” (*emphasis added*, Id. at 5).

Evidently the Board would have reached a different decision had it relied on a narrower understanding of the term “representation” which respect to “using a condensed abstract representation of a search term density distribution.” The amendments are made with that in mind.

## CONCLUSION

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance.

The examiner is requested to call the undersigned to schedule an interview.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that are due in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account No. 09-0441.

Respectfully submitted,  
Dieberger et al.

Date: 08/30/2010

By: Mohammed Kashef/

Mohammed Kashef  
Attorney for Applicants  
Reg. No. 60,762

IBM Almaden Research Center  
Intellectual Property Law  
650 Harry Road, C4TA/J2B  
San Jose, California 95120  
Telephone: (408) 927-3380  
Facsimile: (408) 927-3375  
Kashef@us.ibm.com